

## REMARKS

### Entry of Amendment

As Applicants are filing a RCE herewith, this amendment and the prior response filed June 15, 2011 should be entered and considered by the Examiner at this time.

### Previously Withdrawn Claims

Claims 3-5 were previously listed as “withdrawn” but were not so listed in the Final Rejection. Accordingly, Applicants have not listed these claims as “withdrawn” in this amendment

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103

In the Final Rejection (and apparently maintained in the Advisory Action), the Examiner has the following rejections under 35 USC §103(a):

- A. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14 as being unpatentable over Heeney et al. (EP 1,439,590) in view of Tokito et al. (Journal of Physics: Applied Physics (1996), vol. 29, pages 2750-2753) and Kinlen (US 2004/0018382) with further evidence provided by Liu et al. (Applied Physics Letters, (2007), vol. 91, 142106)
- B. Claims 1-6, 9-16 are rejected as being unpatentable over Takasu et al. (U.S. 2004/0258954) in view of Heeney and Tokito and Hosokawa (US 2002/0045061) and Kinlen with further evidence provided by Liu and Angelopoulos et al. (U.S. 5,198,153).
- C. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14 are rejected as being unpatentable over Heeney in view of Ikeda et al. (WO 2005/031798) and Kinlen with further evidence provided by Liu.
- D. Claims 1-6, 9-16 are rejected as being unpatentable over Takasu in view of Heeney and Ikeda and Hosokawa and Kinlen with further evidence provided by Liu and Angelopoulos.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed, for at least the reasons discussed in Applicants’ prior response filed June 15, 2011.

While Applicants traverse these rejections, in order to advance the prosecution of this

application, Applicants are amending each of independent claim to recite “a hole injecting layer (e.g. **117 in Fig. 1B**) in contact with the first electrode (e.g. **101**); a first layer (e.g. **116**) in contact with the hole injecting layer, wherein an ionization potential of the hole injecting layer is larger than an ionization potential of the first layer (e.g. **pages 14-15 of the specification**); a light emitting layer (e.g. **112**) in contact with the first layer” (support for these features is shown, for example by the references in parenthesis).

In contrast, it appears that none of the cited references discloses or suggests at least the claimed features of “the first layer in contact with the hole injecting layer, wherein an ionization potential of the hole injecting layer is larger than an ionization potential of the first layer” of the independent claims.

Moreover, Liu et al. (Applied Physics Letters, (2007), vol. 91, 142106) should be removed as prior art since it was published in 2007, whereas the earliest U.S. filing date of the subject application is April 7, 2006. Hence, Liu is not prior art.

Therefore, independent Claims 1-5 are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, and Claims 1-5 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these rejections be withdrawn.

#### New Claims

Applicant is also adding new dependent Claims 17 and 18. These claims are also supported, for example, on pages 14-15 of the specification of the present application.

As these are dependent claims, they are allowable for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims. Accordingly, as a RCE is being filed herewith, it is respectfully requested that these new claims be entered and allowed.

If any fee should be due for these new claims, please charge our deposit account 23/0920.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, the RCE, the extension of time, and/or the new claims, please charge our deposit account 23-0920.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Date: September 14, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark J. Murphy/

Mark J. Murphy

Registration No. 34,225

Husch Blackwell LLP  
120 South Riverside Plaza  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 526-1533

Customer No. 24628